REPORT RESUMES

ED 013 348 24 AA 000 200
GENERAL EDUCATION IN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES. NEW DIMENSIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION, NUMBER 24.
BY- BLACKBURN, ROBERT T.
DUKE UNIV., DURHAM, N.C.
REPORT NUMBER BR-6-1722-24 PUB DATE APR 67
CONTRACT OEC-2-6-061722-1742
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.68 92P.

DESCRIPTORS- *GENERAL EDUCATION, *LIBERAL ARTS, *COLLEGES, PROFESSORS, LITERATURE REVIEWS, *COLLEGE FACULTY, FACULTY MOBILITY, FACULTY RECRUITMENT, *COLLEGE CURRICULUM, EXPERIMENTAL CURRICULUM, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, *STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS,

AN ASSESSMENT WAS MADE OF THE STATUS OF GENERAL EDUCATION IN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES. THE GENERAL EDUCATION MOVEMENT WAS STARTED TO PROVIDE SPECIAL CROSS-DISCIPLINARY COURSES AS AN ANSWER TO THE DESIRE FOR UNITY OF KNOWLEDGE. LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES WITHIN UNIVERSITIES WERE NOT STUDIED. THE AUTHOR STATES, "THE GENERAL EDUCATION MOVEMENT IS DEAD." HE ATTRIBUTES ITS DEATH TO (1) INADEQUATE NUMBERS OF COMMITTED AND QUALIFIED FACULTY MEMBERS, (2) INADEQUATE PROGRAM LEADERSHIP, (3) INCREASE IN NUMBERS OF STUDENTS AND CHANGES IN THEIR CHARACTERISTICS, (4) NEW DEMANDS FOR SPECIALIZATION, AND (5) CHANGES IN LEARNING THEORY WHICH CLAIM THAT CROSS-DISCIPLINARY STUDIES CANNOT BE MASTERED BY STUDENTS WITHOUT A FIRM FOUNDATION IN AT LEAST TWO DISCIPLINES. THE AUTHOR CONCLUDES THAT THE FUTURE OF GENERAL EDUCATION IN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES WILL BE CONTINGENT UPON THE FUTURE STATE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE ITSELF. IN DISCUSSING THE FUTURE OF LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES, THE AUTHOR STATES THAT SINCE COLLEGES EXIST PRINCIPALLY FOR THE FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION AND ONLY SECONDARILY FOR STUDENTS AND SOCIETY, THEIR SURVIVAL SEEMS SURE. HE STATES, ALSO, THAT RESEARCH IS NEEDED (1) ON FACULTY ATTITUDES AND ABILITIES TO MATCH FACULTY MEMBERS AND COLLEGE, (2) ON COURSE COSTS, (3) ON THE PROCESS OF CREATING NEW PROGRAMS, (4) ON WHAT IS GENUINELY NEW IN EDUCATION, AND (5) ON WHAT IS EFFECTIVE. THE AUTHOR CONCLUDES CHANGE IS BEING FORCED BY ECONOMIC PRESSURES, MORE SOPHISTICATED STUDENTS, AND FACULTY MOBILITY. HE STATES THAT CURRICULUM CHANGE WILL HAVE TO OCCUR, AND CONCLUDES BY DESCRIBING MANY KINDS OF CHANGE NOW BEING INITIATED IN VARIOUS COLLEGES. (AL)

BR-6-1722-24

PA 24

ED013348

NEW DIMENSIONS
in Higher Education

Number 24

GENERAL EDUCATION IN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

April, 1967

The literature research review reported in this manuscript was made possible by Contract Number OEC 2-6-061722-1742 between Duke University, Durham, North Carolina and the United States Office of Education.

AA000200

NEW DIMENSIONS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 24

GENERAL EDUCATION IN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

by Robert T. Blackburn

Everett H. Hopkins, Editor

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

JOHN GARDNER, Secretary
Office of Education
HAROLD HOWE II, Commissioner

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Robert T. Blackburn began his undergraduate education at the University of Wisconsin. Upon returning from World War II he studied at the University of Chicago where he earned his S. B., S. M., and Ph. D. degrees. His formal schooling includes also a brief interlude at the Graduate School of Harvard University.

Professor Blackburn has taught continuously in general education programs, principally in the physical sciences. His earlier teaching positions were at Chico State College and George Williams College, and then later at the University of Chicago, San Francisco State College (as faculty chairman of the general education committee), and for the past eight years at Shimer College where he served as College Examiner and Dean of Faculty. In Autumn, 1966, he joined the faculty of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan as Professor of Higher Education.

For many years Professor Blackburn has been an active consultant and examiner for the North Central Association. This professional work has kept him in close relationships with liberal arts colleges and undergraduate education programs. His most recent writing was a college science book, INTERRELATIONS: THE BIOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES (Chicago, Scott-Foresman & Co., 1966).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

About the Author iii

Foreword v

Highlights vi

I. Introduction 1

II. The Current Status of General Education 6

Birth of the General Education Movement

The Early Years

The Prime Years

III. Some Unanswered Qeustions: Areas for New Research 35

IV. The Outlook for the Future 43

Footnotes 67

Annotated Bibliography 76

Reactions

FOREWORD

(If and when this manuscript is published for general distribution, the Editor will gladly prepare an appropriate Foreword for the wider audience.)

HIGHLIGHTS

1. The purpose of the monograph is to provide a current assessment of the status of general education in liberal arts colleges. General education is identified with the development of special cross-disciplinary courses--usually required courses taught by several faculty members. The general education movement was an attempt to provide an answer to the desire for unity of knowledge. (The liberal arts colleges examined here exclude such colleges existing within universities.)

2. The conclusion reached by Professor Blackburn is that the general education movement is dead.

3. The principal factors that led to its demise are:

   a) Inadequate numbers of faculty members who were qualified and committed to the movement;

   b) Inadequate leadership, ranging from weaknesses in presidential leadership to the later departure of the early faculty leaders in the movement.

   c) The increase in numbers of students and the changes in their characteristics;

   d) The events of the mid-fifties that gave to society a demand for increased specialization; and

   e) Changes in learning theory, changes that demonstrate the desirability of learning different disciplines at different ages and which support belief that one must know a subject intimately before meaningful cross-disciplinary considerations are possible.

4. What will happen next in undergraduate education is seen to be contingent upon the future of liberal arts colleges. The current trend seems to distribute liberal education over four years (rather than concentrating in the first two), to create capstone courses for seniors, and to be more concerned with inquiry (process) than with principles (elements) of a discipline. These trends are seen as efforts to answer the original quest for unity.

5. Inasmuch as the key to successful programs of liberal education resides with the faculty, the most vital research needed is on the nature and the nurturing of faculty members.

I. INTRODUCTION

> As things are there is disagreement about the subjects. For mankind are by no means agreed about the things to be taught, whether we look to virtue or the best life. Neither is it clear whether education is more concerned with intellectual or moral virtues. The existing practice is perplexing, no one knows on what principle we should proceed--should the useful in life, or should virtue, or should the higher knowledge, be the aim of our training.[1]

Ten years ago Russell Thomas began an article by quoting these words.[2] Certainly they are as pertinent today, or a decade ago, as they were when written three centuries before Christ, and most likely they will be pertinent a century or more from now. If one were to remain faithful to the Aristotelian spirit, he would immediately define the key terms of this monograph--"general education" and "liberal arts colleges." However, wisdom transmitted from colleagues would advise avoiding the first task. Many have tried; most have concluded that the diverse views of general education preclude universal agreement on a meaningful statement. A remark from an academic dean captures the nebulousness of the present state of general education:

> General education, like motherhood and patriotism, is very desirable and everyone, or almost everyone, is strongly in favor of it. Unfortunately, of all of those who

> favor general education, few agree as to what general education is, and fewer still have ever undertaken any studies to find out what general education does.

It is difficult enough to clearly define a liberal arts college. Many universities have within their structure distinguished liberal arts colleges, including the three so often credited as being the parents of several strains of general education--Chicago, Columbia, and Harvard. Since the manuscript in this series, by Cassidy and Haddix, addresses itself to general education in the complex university, the analysis offered here is concerned principally with general education in the liberal arts college.

One can easily recognize the small liberal arts colleges that are not engaged in graduate programs; these colleges are proper ones for inclusion. But how should one classify, say, state colleges in California? Many began as normal schools, grew into teachers colleges, moved on to the status of state colleges offering the B.A., and now are awarding masters degrees in numerous disciplines. Most likely they soon will be certifying doctor of education degrees; for all intents and purposes, they are "complex universities." Some of these "colleges" are included. (Some smaller liberal arts colleges also are involved in graduate programs--e.g., the M.A.T.--but herein they are considered as liberal arts colleges.)

So, Aristotle's perplexity and lack of guiding principles continue even to the codifying of colleges. Definition remains elusive.

This past summer more than 200 academic deans were asked to openly express their thoughts regarding general education in liberal arts colleges--past, present, and future. Their institutions were not a statistically representative sample of the many colleges in this country. In the main they were institutions involved in general education or were colleges currently engaged in curricular revision. Some effort was made to achieve representation by geography, by the method of control, by the nature of their students, etc., so that there might be some response from almost every "type" of liberal arts college.

Responses from my former colleagues were truly gratifying. Their words have been quoted from time to time, as in the second paragraph of this introduction, but without recognition being extended. No statistical tally of their free and open responses was undertaken. They are considered as spokesmen and, when preponderant, as indicators of viewpoints.

The replies, ranging from a brief paragraph or two to a half-dozen or more pages, often accompanied by monographs, reprints, articles, and committee reports, would easily fill a volume 20 times the size of this one and with profundity proportional to its weight. So I particularly want to acknowledge my debt to these ladies and gentlemen for supplying me not only with facts and ideas but with well-turned phrases. Perhaps I was fortunate to catch deans at an off moment, during the "relaxed" season when they were far enough away from the press of daily problems to reflect upon what it is they are doing.

The other and primary "data" for the study comes from the "literature"--primarily the journals and books but also the descriptive efforts to be found in catalogues, reports, and other materials from liberal arts colleges. Unfortunately, although this is not unique to general education programs in liberal arts colleges, the number of evaluative documents was exceedingly small. The predominant literature is that of opinion, not of evidence. Nevertheless, one should not be dissuaded from making use of the opinions of those who have studied, worked, and written on the subject; those who are talented and knowledgeable in higher education have considered opinions and are to be judged accordingly. G. W. Pierson put the problem well:

> After reviewing all these matters (knowledge explosion, speed and magnitude of social change, finance)...I think it is fair to conclude that the curriculum of Yale College (as of other colleges) has not been easy to regulate or even to understand. In fact, there is some danger that we will rationalize our past programs (and our present prospects) more than is warranted; for the truth is that the shaping and ordering of the modern liberal education has been an immensely complex business, interwined with moral, economic and intellectual considerations, a product of emotion as well as reason--in short, as irrational and confusing as society itself.[3]

Finally, despite the difficulty of generalization and in the face of diversity of opinion, a stand on the status of general education in the liberal arts college has been taken. I alone am responsible for the defense of the conclusion that has been reached.

II. THE CURRENT STATUS OF GENERAL EDUCATION

The general education movement is dead.

Not all agree. James Rice, for example, said recently:

> Today there is probably less hazard to a young faculty member going into programs of general education than at any other time in the past. This is especially true if he is willing to make a career of it. New programs are coming into being in large numbers; established programs are expanding.[4]

Others tend to question the health of general education. David Truman, Columbia College's dean, writes in the foreword to Daniel Bell's The Reforming of General Education:[5]

> Favored in the past by a general education program that has proved itself both distinguished and effective, Columbia College nevertheless cannot for the future complacently and without reflection persist in an undertaking that may conceivably be out of date, and not merely out of fashion.

Several years ago, Robert Patton of the Journal of Higher Education entitled his editorial "General Studies: Going or Coming?"[6] And two issues earlier in the same journal, Bernard Wishy offered the following as a subtitle to his article on general education: "How Can It Be Restored to Health?"[7] Even the dean of one of the firmly established and larger colleges of general education, Edward A. Carlin of Michigan State University, said in regard to the future of general education that "an honest opinion must concede that it hangs in the balance."[8]

The number is fewer who have entertained the position announced at the outset. Joseph Axelrod is one. His examination of general education and its history concluded that "the general education movement, too, came to its end, and the term itself has almost fallen into disuse."[9] Harold Hodgkinson, dean of Bard College, used almost these very words in a private communication after the above had been written; he wrote: "My feeling is that as a movement, general education is dead."[10]

There is other evidence for the obituary posted. Not untypical comments from deans of distinguished liberal arts colleges were the following:

> I think the general education movement, as it took shape in the mid-forties, especially right after the war, was an extremely important movement.
>
> In a liberal arts college, in contrast to the university, there still is continued interest in general education. The term, however, has rapidly become associated with the educational jargon of a past era and perhaps its usefulness is impaired by the fact that people associate it with educational movements of several decades ago.
>
> The kind of curricular innovations...which occurred at the time the general education movement was at its height have to a large extent disappeared.
>
> It is true that my college has been involved in general education for several decades, but the trend here is away from it.

> The general education program has had a healthy impact on the rest of the curriculum even though the general education program today seems to have spent itself.

> ...our approach to a liberal education, which term we prefer to general education,...

> To me the term "general education" is already an obsolete one. To begin with, it is difficult to know what one has in mind.

More on this same theme could be quoted; a few statements in a different spirit must be admitted. The latter, however, came from colleges that are just moving into the liberal arts area and apparently believe they should begin with a program of general education.

Much more striking evidence for my contention comes from rather indirect sources--in fact, from the things that did not occur. In Samuel Baskin's Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, a current commentary on what is topical across the country, two of the chapters deal with the curriculum and problems of general education.[11] However, when Baskin summarizes the various contributions to this excellent study and describes the activities of many liberal arts colleges, there is not a single mention of general education.

Also, in Roger Kelsey's bibliography on higher education, only two of nearly 900 entries deal with general education as a curricular problem, and only one of these had been published since 1960.[12]

It is true that his extensive search of the literature was not completely exhaustive, yet the lack of attention to the state of general education today in liberal arts colleges, as compared to what it was 20 years ago, strongly supports the statement that the general education movement is, indeed, dead. Let it be emphasized, however, that it is the general education movement that is dead, not a concern for undergraduate education, nor for the future of liberal arts colleges. The contemporary clergy's serious advocates of the "God-is-dead" movement are speaking to the death of a god of a generation or two ago, not to the death of a spiritual ethic. Likewise, the thesis of this presentation speaks to a phenomenon and a historical event, not to the elimination of a genuine, existent, and serious problem--the nature of an appropriate undergraduate curriculum and a proper setting for its functioning.

Let us now look at what it was that led to the conception of general education, the characteristics of the students it served, the faculty members who endeavored to make it work, and the major factors responsible for its demise. It was a movement on which much energy was expended but its life-span was short.

Birth of the General Education Movement

The classical system of higher education (for the training of the ministry, of the doctor and lawyer, of the public servant, and of the socially elite) that characterized early American higher education was inherited from Europe. It was Eliot at Harvard who introduced the famous (infamous?) elective system as a countermeasure to the earlier pattern of assimilating the societal clientele into higher education. John Brubacher and Willis Rudy have told us this part of the story extremely well;[13] one will also profit from reading Hoyt Trowbridge's historical report.[14]

The 38th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, General Education in the American College, chronicles the event.[15] The chapters by Alvin C. Eurich, John Dale Russell, and Donald P. Cottrell are of particular significance. About this same time, Robert Maynard Hutchins persuasively spoke of the need for his conception of general (liberal) education.[16]

Volumes by Stewart G. Cole, Russell Thomas, and Daniel Bell, capitalizing on a more distant historical vantage point,described what happened when the child's incubation period in the thirties ended and he became a full-fledged infant in the forties.[17] That the effect of the depression was shattering, that democracy was to be a panacea, that John Dewey indeed influenced people, that a reaction to overspecialization was inevitable, that higher education was for the many and not for the few, for the common man and not just for a small sector of the privileged--these and other factors contributed to what was indeed a significant and an extraordinarily healthy contribution to the advancement of higher education.[18]

The Early Years

During the early period of the general education movement, Earl McGrath, then at the State University of Iowa, founded the Journal of General Education (October, 1946). His journal played a leading role in the advancement of general education by acquainting the enthusiast with the way courses were constructed and taught at various institutions as well as by supplying moral support and rationalizations for the necessity of the movement. The contributors to the journal were outstanding authorities in higher education and their well-deserved prestige helped the movement's momentum.

Cooperation in General Education is an excellent collection of essays concerning influences on the general education movement during this period of its early history. The first chapter, "Factors Influencing the Development of General Education," considers both social and intellectual factors of general education as well as accepted beliefs about how people learn and what they can learn.[19] Articles by Lucius Garvin and by Charles L. Stone in 1947 provide fine accounts of the rise of general education in liberal arts colleges and the philosophical basis upon which this movement was built. General education's youthful vigor was contagious.[20]

By July, 1948, McGrath had conducted a review of the general education movement and ventured predictions as to its future.[21] For the most part his perceptions were excellent. He saw the decline of the survey course and a change toward depth penetration of a subject area, and he correctly anticipated the introduction of the fine arts into these programs. His prediction that there would be an increase in the prescribed subject matter came true in one sense but not in another. The movements toward "home and family" and of communications for English did not attain the fruition he envisioned. He also carefully detailed the obstacles to the general education movement. Most of them had to do with the acquisition, retention, and care of a faculty to manage the programs that were being either launched or envisaged at many schools across the country.

Not everyone, however, was converted. Henry Wriston described the curriculum at his university (Brown) at about this time and indicated that there were other ways in which liberal education could be accomplished.[22]

Other educators were going in another direction, and for deliberate reasons. Long before the purity of the mainstream was questioned and made a national issue, a few bold venturers avoided the polluted waters and remained content to explore tributaries that might lead nowhere. Harold Taylor, at this time president of Sarah Lawrence, presented his case for a quite different, even contradictory, philosophy of undergraduate education.[23] Prescribed courses and required programs were contrary to his view which focused first upon the student. The contributions of the Journal of Higher Education from the mid-forties to the early fifties, also essentially ignored those matters around which others thought the whole world turned. This journal's attention was given principally to such pressing matters as the G.I. Bill, education in the Army, adult education, and increased enrollment--all significant problems in higher education and only incidentally related to general education per se.

Despite the fact that not everyone was enchanted with general education, this was probably still its most exuberant era. Contrasting an observer from Jupiter in 1950 to a Martian in the twenties, David Owen thought the Jupiterian might be "wondering whether an itch to reform the course of study were not an occupational disease of the post-war educator. Occupational disease or not, they would be clear that it had reached epidemic proportions."[24]

As we will see in the next few pages, a healthful environment for a general education program has been contingent upon the contributions of scientists and the attitudes of science faculties. When these contributions were considerable and attitudes were favorable, as they were during this time, the general education movement flourished. James B. Conant's contributions to science in general education--as chemist, educator, president of Harvard, and as a person--would be one noteworthy example. Also the philosophers of science from the Vienna Circle were then popular in the United States and they attracted a number of scientists who contributed to the movement.

General Education, it is clear, flaunted a flamboyant youth.

The Prime Years

The series of volumes edited by McGrath can proudly stand as a testimony of the movement's peak accomplishment.[25] Each contains descriptions of courses from a variety of institutions across the United States--from junior colleges to liberal arts colleges to complex universities. Other literature reveals that faculty invention and creation of new courses was an active, highly time-consuming passion.[26] Survey courses were passing smoothly from the scene to be replaced by courses focusing on problems--the so-called block-and-gap approach. A concern for evaluation of the movement was under way, for the prime movers were aware that there was little evidence that the courses created in the general education movement were in any way the equivalent of, to say nothing about their being superior to, the conventional kind of liberal arts program.[27] These same authors, however, were of the opinion that at this stage "general education is booming."

The Decline

Rarely is the onset of a plague determined with a high degree of precision and certainty. Its first symptoms escape detection even by the practitioners and healers. Even in retrospect the record is inadequate to authenticate a particular interpretation.

Similarly, when institutions of higher learning in this country are as variegated as they are--when one finds some colleges today beginning programs others initiated a score of years ago and discarded as much as a decade ago--then certainly it is understandable that neither an exact time nor place for the decline of general education can be offered here. As a rough guide, however, the late fifties will be regarded as that span when the decline accelerated and the plague spread from its incipient days. Moreover, the biological, and now medical, image adopted proves inadequate. While a human disease may have a single cause, it is doubtful that the infections to which colleges or educational movements are susceptible are ever unitary.

A significant event can be observed in Knox Hill's editorial announcements that the Journal of General Education was suspending publication.[28] This act acknowledged a condition, although it did not specify the virus.[29] Again, the plague did not spread from a single germ transmitted in a clearly defined manner from location to location or from person to person.

For the sake of convenience in talking about the spread of the disease that led to the death of the general education movement, certain variables must be discussed: (1) the role played by faculty; (2) the kind of leadership displayed by institutions that accommodated general education programs; (3) those matters that have to do with students and their expanding numbers; (4) the three S's--Sputnik, Specialization, and Science; (5) some contributions from learning theory; and (6) the nature of faculties, as distinct from their role. These and other factors were sources of infection or were infected in such a way that the composite disease produced a corpus beyond recovery.

1. The Role Played by Faculty

The concern for a faculty qualified to teach the new kinds of courses-- in cross-graduate departmental categories, and to create programs that formed a whole, rather than to teach courses (sometimes renamed) that were propaedeutic to courses that were preliminary for other courses that were prerequisite to the Ph.D. in a particular subject--was at the heart of the problem. The unknown source of these people and the inadequacy of their numbers was foreseen very early as a critical hurdle in the general education movement. While others expressed this view even before the forties, Bigelow and Maclean quite perceptively identified what observers ever since have nominated as the primary problem in general education.[30]

Earl J. McGrath's editorials in the first two issues of the Journal of General Education addressed the problem of securing qualified faculty to teach in the general education movement.[31] McGrath's particular hope for solution, a notion not novel nor unique to him, was to change the degree programs and requirements in such ways that the Ph.D.'s would be the source of adequate faculty. He cited studies which showed that the percentage of useful research from Ph.D.'s was minimal and hence intimated that the vast majority of university-trained people were already scholar-teachers rather than scholar-publishers. In March, 1948, R. H. Eckelberry urged the then dean of Columbia College, Harry J. Carman--for the idea was suggested by him (and also by Howard Mumford Jones in his book, Education and World Tragedy)--to motivate graduate schools to do something in preparing teachers for general education.[32] He went on to say, in effect: "Columbia, why doesn't your graduate school experiment and find out if it can produce such individuals?" Writing in 1955 in the Journal of General Education, Edward Rosenheim again stressed the need for graduate education of future faculty members in the general education program.[33]

In 1957 Joseph R. Gusfield provided a sociological analysis of a faculty member's career in general education.[34] He demonstrated the pitfalls and dangers of a professor who selects general education as his career entree. Gusfield warned that he will find himself inadequately trained, that he will have a low status for the most part since he has cast his lot with freshmen and sophomores and not with upper division and graduate students, and that his personal characteristics (since he is apt to be a critic of his establishment) militate against him. All of these dangers tend to create a situation that gives the general education teacher unidirection. He may move into general education with ease, for he will be sought after and welcomed; to move out again, however, is likely to be difficult and uncommon.

F. D. Kershner's career-problem analysis of faculty in general education made similar findings. Kershner looked at what is the "pay-off" and what is prestigious in higher education today and concluded that the reputation for research, not general education, is the appropriate label for the faculty member to acquire. Sigmund Nosow, however, disagreed.[35]

Considering the academic status of general education at this point in its history, Sidney J. French attributed its failure to the faculty shortage, a shortage resulting from graduate schools not preparing teachers for general education. General education itself remains valid, French stated, but there has not been sufficient faculty to keep the project alive.[36] When Daniel Bell says "general education, we are told, is in a state of 'crisis,'" one of the four major factors he cites is the difficulties met by institutions in finding staff; Bell also relates this to what has happened or, better, has not happened in the graduate schools.[37]

It is true that graduate schools have concentrated with rather few exceptions on an ever-narrowing subject area within the discipline for their Ph.D. requirements. The cries of the past have hardly been heeded and seldom by the prestigious institutions which might give support to novel programs, even were they desirable. Such talk is not new; no doubt it will be heard again for some other movement, if not for general education. And it, too, will be in vain. The reports of the alienated at the Berkeley campus of the University of California recommend a symbol signifying the holder has an A.B.D. degree. The University of Michigan's graduate dean is trumpeting a similar symbol of recognition. However, even if such should occur--and it just might as a substitute for the less-trained, neophyte graduate student teaching freshman and sophomore sections--the colleges (particularly the liberal arts colleges unattached to a complex university) are going to ask for a Ph.D., no matter where it came from or what requirements its holder satisfied in acquiring it.

The faculty problem has not always been one of training; it has also been and is one of numbers. In fact, the numbers game seems to be a better bit of cocktail party chit-chat than the quality versus quackery routine. Allan M. Cartter, one of the authorities who earlier forecast the shortage of faculty in the age of college expansion, more recently has written that the data misled him: there is not a shortage of teachers![38] But deans of faculty who are trying to replace retiring and departing brethren and to fill newly created places in expanding colleges know well that though they may have a number of applicants, they judge the majority of them unqualified and find their first choices difficult to attract. Said another way, whether there is a shortage of faculty or not, everybody believes there is one, and this is what matters. Faculty members behave as if they were in a seller's market and administrators treat them accordingly. Therefore, mobility rises rapidly, the effect of which is instability at home. With his energy directed toward finding new faculty, indoctrinating and retaining them, the dean's attention to the general education program falls farther and farther down on the ever-increasing list of priorities and urgencies.

Another aspect of the faculty problem arises from those "colleagues" in an institution who for any of a host of reasons will assert that general education is not a good thing. They can ask for evidence to defend general education, and this is an awkward, if not impossible, request to meet. Not infrequently the questions are put forth as political maneuver, and one is obliged to grant their effectiveness. General education courses have have had precious little evaluation. That the liberal arts courses they were replacing have also had meager assessment is not an effective counterargument. Forays and harassments on the perimeter further complicate a forward effort.

When conducting an overall review and wondering whether general education's sun was rising or setting, Mayhew noted in the mid-fifties that a fair number of faculty yearned to return to the "good old days."[39] Anyone who has been involved in general education courses at any institution knows the effectiveness of the behavior of those faculty members who are "outside of the action." This kind of tactic and strategy is not confined to the general education movement; it is a part of the game within Academe. Nonetheless, when organized or persistent, and especially when both, such strategy is most effective. There are signs that this attack had a rather good press by the middle and late fifties.

2. Leadership Displayed by Institutions

The key to success in any education enterprise resides with the faculty, for they are the ones who will and do, or will not and do not. It is true that many of the best faculty members in the early days of the general education movement--the ones who planned its conception and gave it the variety of forms and the mutant strains it has taken on--still remain active in the colleges where general education retains an extraordinary strength. They are not, however, full-time teachers as they were before, but rather they have assumed administrative positions. In addition, while no count is in hand, it is apparent that an even larger number of the personnel who gave the movement its impetus are now in new and more remote careers and hence are less active in this arena than they were in the past.

Moreover, any such movement needs support and strength from the deans and primarily from the leaders of the institutions, the presidents of the liberal arts colleges. When one scrutinizes the landscape today and looks at photographs of the past, it is seen that Mr. Hutchins (and Mr. Adler) no longer are located in a college or university, nor is Mr. Conant at a helm. The fine people who succeeded such leaders have done marvelous things for their universities, but unlike their predecessors their primary attention has not been in the direction of general education.

The university president has taken on a new role. Frequently he is involved in national policy. And his fashion for travel, not only to seek money but also to attend meetings of associations for this and that, has filtered down to the presidents of the liberal arts colleges. They are absent from home more and more, knocking on the doors of trustees or friends of trustees, calling on foundations or the like. The consequence is that they know less and less about the activities of the teaching faculty, the arrangements of the curriculum, the frustrations of committee assignments.

The president's life is basically a lonely one. One understands and appreciates his banding together with others, as often is the case, in consortia for or against public or private institutions, with members of a church denomination, with presidents of geographically proximate institutions of a related type, but as his time becomes fractured for assorted activities, his attention to curriculum and quality of instruction dwindles. In the liberal arts college, particularly where the president frequently has a role as shepherd of the flock, the sheep will wander and stray when not properly coddled as they have been accustomed.

The new product of the university graduate school tends to remain truer to the subject in which he has been highly and specially trained than to a college. Now his indoctrination into general education becomes weaker, even if he might have been seduced into it. As Howard A. Cutler remarked not very long ago: "As the torch (of general education) was passed on to succeeding generations (of faculty, and, I would add, presidents), its flame lost both heat and light."[40]

3. The Role Played by Students

Students, too, have contributed to the plague. The problem rests not only in their numbers but also in their nature.

The vast expansion in college enrollments has not affected liberal arts colleges in the same way that it has the junior colleges and state colleges and universities. (The latter are principally public institutions.) The liberal arts colleges simply have not expanded at anywhere near the same rate. In fact, many liberal arts colleges begin each term with vacant beds (and hence fewer dollars than they desire). They fear the loss of students; and only a surprising few private liberal arts colleges are in the genuine choice situation in which they would like to be in. Thus, they are more likely to submit to what the students want. Even the smaller and more remote colleges are in tune (through students) with the bill-of-fare that the larger institutions are dispensing. If his university brethren, who now appreciably outnumber him, no longer receive and wish general education, the private liberal arts college student is not likely to want it either. While accelerated expansion all but prohibits the assimilation of a faculty to teach general education in the larger schools, the large numbers of students there have this indirect but real impact on the liberal arts college.

Then, too, the student of today differs in his nature.[41] A large number of students are first (college) generation youth from families whose parents had little or no college education. Sending sons and daughters away to college is a new experience for these parents, yet it is expected as well as desired by them. It is more than a financial burden for them; it is a matter of genuine decision. Therefore, the product marketed by the college does matter. Professional training is visible, tangible, and real. A program that leads to a degree and also to a to a job in engineering, or in teaching, or in something which is definite, genuine, worthy, and rewarding will be rated high. General education, especially in large doses, sounds rather remote from this, and hence militates against a parental choice of a liberal arts college for their children.

Students have likewise been nurtured on the need to specialize in their secondary school years. The liberal arts college feels it enhances its image by advertising the percentage of its baccalaureates going on to graduate school. Acknowledging the exception of the few professions that claim a preference for a broadly educated person over a specialist,[42] it is not difficult to support the statement that the graduate schools and agencies awarding lucrative and prestigious fellowships look more closely at the number of courses taken in a department than at the number of different departments in which courses have been taken.

At the other extreme is the highly sophisticated youth from the well-to-do family. His problem is somewhat different, but its impact is felt on the campus. He or she is likely to spend the junior year abroad or to participate in a work-study program in some remote or popular place in the world. One can ask how to keep a co-ed locked in the dormitory after she has spent a year in Paris, and the answer is not easy to find. The early courses in the general education movement in the area of marriage and the family and in counseling would hardly be tolerated by today's student when pot and the pill are the conversation in the grill.

If there is one common denominator characterizing today's student, it is that he is opposed to what is required. General education, like social regulation, most often is required. (The old creaks just because it is old.) Ergo, be against it.

These student-centered factors by themselves do not mean that general education could not live. As we shall see a little later on, however, these forces, especially when coupled with the noise of a new faculty member unwillingly assigned to a general course, seem to be capable of influencing the leaders of institutions and of tearing asunder the general education movement.

4. The Role of the Three S's

Even if Sputnik was not the cause of the decline of general education, its heralded flight transposed education from an occasional feature story to front page news. Almost on that eventful day, an inevitable era arrived. Secularism, specialization, economic reorganization, and education in science received prime space.

Efficiency, effectiveness, and visibly crowded classrooms turn one's eyes toward the mass media such as television, language laboratories, and teaching machines as possible means of education. Gadgetry in the form of teaching aids is not a new idea. What is new is the attention given by universities and colleges to instruction by such devices. Also new are the considerable sums of money and energy expended on them by faculty members and administrative staffs. Faculty talents were not directed toward the general education movement or the liberal arts college. Thus, both of them suffered, at least from neglect. "The success of the general education movement," Knox Hill wrote, "has always depended to a large extent upon its winning the support of the natural scientists. The support it has thus far received has seldom been wholehearted."[43]

The teaching of science has always been a special problem in the general education movement.[44] It is worth noting that Columbia College abandoned its required general courses in science as early as 1946. In the late forties Sidney French, reporting at a conference on the place of science in general education, remarked upon the difficulty of obtaining faculty members to teach such courses. The record shows that the science Ph.D. graduate is most productive and creative in his early years, and he wishes to concentrate his energies on his field, not on teaching in general education.[45] In the late fifties general education scientists simply disappeared from view.

The reasons for the scientific flaw in the movement are diversified and difficult to substantiate. Some people have thought that the natural sciences are significantly different from the humanities and social sciences; in fact, the division of knowledge into these three areas already postulates some kind of difference. Thus, it is asserted that the very nature of the subject causes faculty members to be unwilling to teach it in general education programs. That Zacharias, Bruner, and others have been reasonably successful in moving sophisticated science instruction to the earlier years while not having had a comparable effect in the humanities and social sciences may give some support to this view that the difficulty resides in the subject itself.[46]

Other factors also account for the disappearance of science faculty members from general education. For example, the climate in which the scientist lives and works--a climate which seems to be dictated to him as being his acceptable way of life--is quite different from that of the humanist and the social scientist. The education the scientist has received is typically illiberal compared to that which engaged the humanist and social scientist. Because of his never having had one, the natural scientist's concern for a general or a liberal education could conceivably be weaker than that of his liberally educated colleague. The problem may go even deeper, for a man may enter the field of science simply because of personal aptitudes and characteristics that take him in that direction. One may entertain a popular image of science, that it encompasses certainty and definiteness in solving mathematical problems in physics as opposed to the "openness" and "variedness" one finds in drama or in art.

Whether or not there is any truth in the contention that deeply-rooted personality traits are the cause of a scientist's unwillingness to teach general education (and hence frequently interdisciplinary) courses is not known; nevertheless, very few scientists seem to be working in general education at the collegiate level today. (Those who are directing their talents toward the learning of these disciplines have focused their attention on the reorganization of the high school curriculum.) By quoting from the deans, who look back over the period of time that has been reviewed, we may get a better idea of the situation. One of them says: "Our general education course in science never really got off the ground." Another reports: "There was originally some hope that the natural sciences might introduce a third course. Any interest in doing so was and has been virtually nonexistent."

5. The Role of Learning Theory

Another element militating against the general education movement is a changing view toward learning theory. Professors claim students cannot master cross-disciplinary studies and integrative courses until a firm foundation has been laid in at least two disciplines. Bell, for example, makes this claim when he introduces what he calls "third-tier" courses, that a student would take in his penultimate or last year in his general field of study.[47] As one dean wrote: "It should also be said that most students are just beginning to be able to implement the inter-disciplinary approach by the end of the sophomore year. The full benefit comes in the junior and senior years as the conversation continues."

The truth or falsity of this assertion sounds as if it could be empirically established. The task, however, would be onerous and difficult, and the results would be ambiguous. Since this proposition is not a novel one, perhaps it is simply a reaction to the more dominant forces and is advanced as a rationalization for actions undertaken or contemplated; in any event it seems to be effective.

In this same vein and partly as a consequence of present trends, the overused phrase "knowledge-explosion" is adduced as an argument against general education. Some will say that since it is impossible to learn everything, it is essential to concentrate on the ways of knowing and that therein resides the essence of general education.[48] Others have said--and they seem to have the "winning" argument--that if a student is to be an effective contributor to society and is to go on to graduate school, then he must begin specialization earlier and devote more time to a discipline. Hence, there is no time for those things that are not in his area of specialization.

6. The Nature of the Faculty

In today's academic milieu other factors apparently are operating. Accompanying the faculty mobility mentioned earlier is the academician's attraction to his national and international professional societies, a force vying with his allegiance to the college at which he is teaching.[49] Actually both factors may operate, and it may be that he simply likes to do what others are doing: and attending conventions is today certainly the thing to do.

Today's faculty member finds himself in a position to flex his status, and perhaps this is what is happening. He says: "I can't teach X"; or: "I am not an expert in X. You hired me as an anatomist, not as a biologist." There is little that can be said to him if the institution desires to hold him. Excuse him they will. (Science teaching in general education may be epitomized here. Everyone knows, so they say, that the sciences are superspecialties, and for a specialist to move from one science to another even closely related science is now claimed to be impossible.)

Another factor that is a part of today's age is that the faculty members who were the missionaries and prime movers of the general education development have become tired.[50] Missionaries do. If true, the observation that the typical general education course taught by a large number of faculty members consumes enormous hours reveals a close corollary. In some cases, this factor alone has taken its toll.[51]

Said another way, a faculty can be kept effective and excited so long as the courses they teach provide new insights for them, the faculty. Once the novelty tarnishes or the ramifications of the insight become exhausted--that is, when the staff (without respect to what might be happening to the students) is no longer learning new things--the course is for all intent and purposes dead. A few faculty members may conduct the wake, even extend and carry it on for years, but this is rather a sad excuse for liberal education.

Morris Keeton and his colleagues at Antioch College are sensitive to this respect for their faculty. When revising their general education program, they specifically stated that the new faculty member could create new courses and that there was no obligation on his part to carry on what his predecessor had developed and taught.[52] This practice is not akin to the general education movement of which we have been speaking. It could well be, however, the liberal education of tomorrow.

The plague has run its course. The death toll has been painful. The general education movement's wake is being held.

The Hutchins' program at Chicago departed in the early fifties. Harvard really never developed an integrated set of courses. Columbia is reconsidering its program, but, as Bell has indicated, whatever may come forth would be quite different from what has been: "Despite a rather heroic framework that has been put around the general education efforts at some universities, this part of the curriculum often is looked upon more or less as an academic Siberia within the university."

If current catalogue announcements from typical liberal arts colleges are perused, a great many must be examined before one finds the phrase "general education". Typically today the student selects from a group of courses to satisfy an area requirement. Only rarely does one find a specifically required course that everyone must take. When he does, most often it is introductory English, and this course is passing out of existence in the more selective colleges.

Winslow Hatch's series of monographs under the general title New Dimensions in Higher Education addressed itself to many interesting developments in higher education--experimental colleges, flexibility in undergraduate programs, credit systems, and many other timely subjects, but it is significant that not a single volume dealt with general education. A recent report in the New York Times said President Dickey's "Great Issues" for Dartmouth seniors has seen its last days. What else can go?

The last yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education that dealt with general education was published in 1952; this is already a 14-year lapse when seven-year intervals had prevailed since the early thirties.[53] Nor does one hear any great national cry to bring leading educators together for a conference on general education. If one cannot get people to want a conference, then the state of general education's health is indeed beyond repair.

The day belongs to the student and to the faculty member. They get what they want. What they want is what is not required, no matter what the requirement may be.

The general education movement is dead.

III. SOME UNANSWERED QUESTIONS: AREAS FOR NEW RESEARCH

What will happen to general education in the liberal arts college obviously will be contingent upon the future state of the liberal arts college itself. The cry over its demise has reverberated throughout the past, and has been sharply echoed in a new key quite recently.[54] But crying wolf is not what is at stake; rather teachers, money, and, yes, even students are.[55]

In theory there should be an abundance of first-rate faculty members for the liberal arts colleges, simply because the number of faculty members in higher education is growing more rapidly than there are places in liberal arts colleges. Also a liberal arts college, at least the fairly respectable ones, and certainly all of those that enjoy an earned reputation, should possess higher prestige in a faculty member's mind than the newly created public institutions that are growing so rapidly and adding faculty at the highest rate. As was said earlier, one of the basic problems in higher education is not the matter of numbers but of quality.[56] Mobility is at an all-time high.[57] Yet mobility per se is not bad; a young faculty member is expected to move as a successful career creates horizons for him that extend beyond his college. But when the rate of mobility is extremely high, then instability haunts a small institution. There is not only the difficulty in developing new programs; there is also the problem of maintaining that which is judged to be essential for the college's stature. Mobility also means a lack of production on the part of the faculty member, for moving is a complicated matter. It also means the administrative staff is devoting more energy toward finding new and additional faculty than it is devoting toward curriculum matters.

What is desperately needed is research on the entire business of movement within higher education. It strikes one that a fallacy must exist somewhere within the present body of data. A man can move only so often, and then he must settle in for a longer stay.[58]

Few studies have been conducted that have led to sufficient insight as to what will make a faculty member move and what will keep him in his present job. Opinions abound, but evidence is scarce. Money, schooling for children, opportunities to do what he wishes, etc., all of these enter the picture. But if the liberal arts colleges are different from institutes of technology, junior colleges, and complex universities, what is their special attraction? How do they differ from the others? How do the faculty members at one differ from those at others? For example, what will new Ph.D.'s do? Does it matter whether students are from the first or second generation of their families attending college? Which kinds of colleges motivate students to seek the Ph.D. and a career in college teaching? Liberal arts colleges are sending on a higher and higher percentage of students to graduate schools, but the number they are supplying is necessarily small and the occupational path they eventually follow is not known. Within liberal arts institutions it might be possible to create models that would attract new faculty members and give them an opportunity to make the kind of contributions which they desire and for which they are capable. At the same time, such a model would allow its senior members to grow old gracefully and maintain the status they have earned and deserve. Supposedly such models would keep faculty members circulating inside and outside of special programs of general or liberal education and would not keep them chained in what might become a boring and hence stultifying experience.

To say it again, research should center on the nature of the faculty member, for it is the faculty member who will be the key to the existence or nonexistence of the general and/or liberal arts (or any other) program. It might be thought that with the recent studies by Pace and Stern on college climate and the suitability of the student for a particular type of college, a similar body of data could be obtained so as to match faculty member and college. One can assume that colleges compete with one another only to a small extent in terms of salary or other kinds of benefits (see Summer issues of the AAUP

Bulletin), but there is an atmosphere, a work attitude, that differs from school to school. Knowledge of this kind would benefit every institution of higher education, and hence also liberal and general education in the arts colleges.[59]

Second, the matter of dollars and cents needs a fresh exploration in relation to the liberal arts college. General education when staff-taught in small discussion classes certainly never could be defended on economic grounds. It was costly and continues to be so in liberal arts colleges without teaching assistants. It is here that the pressures for expenditures of other sums come to bear. For example, the arguments for non-Western studies as part of a liberal education seem to be having a genuine impact. Yet there is a real question whether the liberal arts colleges inaugurating such studies have seriously considered the cost of an adequate faculty for teaching non-Western culture, the number and kind of courses to be taught, the facilities involved in teaching these languages, or the price of minimum library. Curricular decisions for the sake of fashion is dreadful education.

Another vogue today is the consortium, or association, of colleges. Institutions of the same denomination join together, or those of the same size join together, or those of the same type, or those of the same geographical area, or those of.... One college may find itself in two or three or more associations of colleges. The benefits to one and to all are better educational programs and the saving of money, so the adduced arguments run. In the former instance, one thinks of shared libraries, guest speakers, and concert series; the latter category suggests shared faculty, or cheaper rates for insurance because of larger numbers. What is not known, however, is the actual cost, or the actual benefit. When one adds the salary of the executive secretary of the association, to the salaries of his regular secretaries, plus the cost of two or three meetings each year that call for travel and living expenses for the presidents and two or three faculty members, plus the overhead expense each college contributes, plus several other kinds of costs, one can appropriately ask, "Is this a real savings?" Such costs might well be put against the uses that are actually made of these associations for educational activity, and it might be worth finding out whether expense is not simply being added for an attention-getting device, advancing the institution's educational program only an iota or two, and actually exhausting meager funds and faculty time that might have been used for the benefit of those already contracted to teach.

A rising percentage of the ever-increasing cost of private liberal arts colleges is being paid for by the consumer. Is this money going for "education"? Or is the amount spent for overhead--

for "development," "admissions," "scholarships," and "public relations"--absorbing an increasing and disproportionate share of a burgeoning tariff? If there is truth to this suspicion, and theoretically the research required to establish the truth is simple, then it might be healthy for these colleges to understand the exorbitant expense of their competitiveness. Better uses for these funds might suggest themselves.

In summary, the financial operation of a college has been viewed pretty much in the same way for a long time. For this reason alone, if not for the host of new kinds of activities in which colleges are now engaged, a fresh look at money and management is needed. If it turns out that what has been done and is now going on is best, the matter will be put to rest; however, one should not be surprised if new methods would suggest themselves and as a consequence be of great benefit to the colleges involved.

A third area needing exploration is the process of creating. When a college decides to start a new program, say, in general education, it is fun; it seems to be all new, even if it really is old. What do game theory, decision making, group dynamics, and other related disciplines have to say about faculty members working together to make new programs in institutions of higher education? One would think that what has been learned in related areas (in business or in psychiatric work, for example) would have application to a college faculty, and might provide insights that would lead to innovations in higher education, innovations that were more than tinkering with calendars and the gadgetry so popular today in the liberal arts college.

Last--and while one hesitates to bring up such ignoble ghosts--a genuine evaluation of what _is_ new and now in use in higher education would certainly be welcome. Such an evaluation has been called for again and again, not only in general education and liberal arts colleges, but in all facets of higher education. Yet, save in rare instances, it simply has not been done.[60]

It is difficult to understand why so few programs of higher education are actually researched. One cannot think of any other business--and higher education is a big and competitive business--that so blatantly ignores its competitors' successes and failures. Educational practitioners demand evidence. Teachers are generous with a red pencil on a student's paper and call him to task for not supplying supporting evidence for what he claims to be a truth; they return student efforts when bibliographies are absent or insufficient. Yet they would tinker with education, especially with general and liberal education, as if no one else had ever done a thing, or had learned a thing, or had learned what not to do.

As has been said, typical of higher education is a faculty's lack of historical study, its failure to adequately search the literature, its complete blindness in requiring evidence (except if one happens to be a faculty member opposed to the "experiment" of the day). Opinion suffices. And what has been happening will be tabled or discarded for the sake of the new simply on the basis of enthusiasm, committee judgment, or on the reputation of the individuals involved. It is indeed an incredible procedure. Large sums of money, even millions of dollars, have been spent on new programs when there was no knowledge whether the old was more effective or less effective than the new.[61]

Such is life in Academe.

Bless it.

IV. THE OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The hazards of prediction are even more poignant to those who have exercised the ritual than to those who have read with rightful alarm the prognoses of others, and renowned observers and participants in the general education movement have made forecasts in the past.[62] What will happen to general education in the liberal arts college in the future will depend upon what happens to the liberal arts colleges themselves, especially in the current era. This is obviously a truism, but it is one that needs reassertion.

Diverse views have been advanced as to what the future portends for those historic institutions that have made a unique and significant contribution to American higher education. One of these views is embodied in the Study of the Future of Liberal Arts Colleges (FLAC) under way at Yellow Springs, Ohio. Morris Keeton, vice president for academic affairs at Antioch College, is the director of the study; the reports on the study will soon be available. In his view: "The future of private liberal arts colleges is not a question of survival, but one of significance.... Of all the questions..., the greatest is that of the choice of core purposes for these colleges.[63]

Keeton's assertion, one resulting from his studies, can be heartily endorsed. At this writing, however, his evidence is unknown so that only one supportive argument is advanced, one that is more speculative than empirical; possibly, then, it will not duplicate the research findings which will be adduced at Yellow Springs.

It would appear that most of those who predict a dire fate for the liberal arts college base their notion on a false assumption, the belief that colleges exist for the sake of society or for a particular student clientele. Today's students and their needs are substantially different from students of the past; the high school and the university supply the materials that society and youth formerly expected from the liberal arts college. So the proponents of this notion argue.

In all probability it is more truthful to say that the colleges today exist principally for two groups of adults, namely, the faculty and administration, and only secondarily for students and society. These colleges exist as a place for faculty members to lead the kind of life they enjoy, as a place for them to work. Once a college reaches its mature stage, it casts itself in a form that becomes known to the outside world. The form may be quite different from the original conception of its founders. But once the college enjoys a reputation, it then simply attracts those students who would like to live the kind of life that the faculty there has found rewarding.

So, should the chips really be down, the faculty members and their president--on the pretext of the importance of private enterprise, the necessity for the whole man, the inhumanities of multi-universities, or some other noble venture--will fight for their economic and cultural survival. They are happy where they are, for the most part, and wish to continue in their present capacity. Presidents are human beings too in this respect, and they do not like to oversee failures. Closing a college is a failure, and the president will attempt to keep it open, forever and forever if possible.[64] Liberal arts colleges will not die, or at least the vast majority of them will not. But they will change: the better ones already have changed and are doing so today, just as they have throughout their history.

With survival a reality, we can now look at the activities that are receiving the highest priorities in liberal arts colleges. After these have been examined, reasons can be advanced to account for this behavior. Once causes for these activities are in view, and after the consequences of other forces and pressures have been extrapolated, a supportable prognosis of general and liberal education in liberal arts colleges can be put forward.

Most of the changes in liberal arts colleges today have to do with the paraphernalia of pedagogy and much less with the aims and purposes of liberal education, with general education, or with curriculum. In this regard, Baskin's Higher Education: Some Newer Developments is an excellent source.[65] Much has been done, for example, in revising the academic calendar. The notions of three semesters per calendar year, or three semesters during the typical academic year, or a semester separated by a month in mid-winter followed by another semester, or the so-called 4-1-4 plan and its many varieties--these come off the public relations presses of colleges with great frequency these days. There is also much activity which involves converting from credits to courses, or reducing the number of different subjects to be studied by students at one time. An increasingly common pattern reveals a requirement of 35 to 36 courses to graduate rather than 120 or 124 semester hours (or a proportionate number of quarter hours). There also seems to be greater flexibility in the length of the class period and even in the scheduling of classes themselves.

Other popular devices have to do with independent study, demanding that the student assume the responsibility for an increasing share of his education. This phenomenon is anything but new since a minimum of 150 colleges had independent study in 1927.[66] Apparently, few institutions are being successful in convincing students--and this is no easy matter--that grades may not be the most important part of collegiate life. Relatively few institutions have successfully operated on an appeal to the student's intellectual endeavor without a measurable reward and punishment system. As graduate schools become the home and the future goal of more and more students in liberal arts colleges, and as long as graduate departments remain in their present position of power--to dictate what they will accept and reject--one can anticipate that only the strongest of the liberal arts colleges will dare let their reputations speak for their graduates. The overwhelming majority will submit to the demand of the students for grades, for Johnny will claim, whether true or not, that he did not get into the university of his choice because he did not have the customary evaluation of his performance. Thus, one might safely predict that a gradeless movement will not be infectious.

Study abroad in the junior year, or at almost any time, seems to be increasing in popularity, even though quite obviously the advocated "need" is diminishing. As the world becomes one, as students travel to foreign lands during summers and are visited by their counterparts and colleagues from other countries, the need to know what another culture is like through a transfer experience diminishes. But affluence, prestige, and similar factors--factors that outweigh the probable actual value of the education itself--increase the tempo of this movement.

Morehouse recorded the activities of colleges in non-Western studies in 1958.[67] Soon afterward in the Journal of General Education an entire issue was devoted to a description of non-Western study courses at a variety of institutions.[68] In fact, in the very next issue there were for the first time advertisements for a book on Asia and for residency in an international house. This trend seems to have increased, for in January, 1962, there were four articles on study abroad. (One should point out, however, that study abroad and non-Western civilization seem to meet only on the rarest of occasions. Paris is more romantic than Lahore.) The movement seems to be so strong that one dean writes: "We are planning to give more attention to international education in our general education program. We are thinking of requiring one term abroad for all students."

Other noticeable trends are worth observing. One of these is the creation of special courses for non-majors, that is, one social science course for those students who plan to concentrate in the humanities and natural sciences, but usually not for the majors themselves. This is the sort of idea for new courses from which one could rightfully anticipate that some exciting curricula will evolve, although it is not a novel activity.[69]

Allied to this trend, but different, is "flexibility," a major password in the active and innovative liberal arts college.[70] Under this generic term one finds many variations; some are new, but more are old. For example, one dean sees

> more and more colleges...changing to a "distribution" system, assuming that any choice of courses from a large menu will satisfy the needs of general education. The major assumption behind this change is that of "exposure"--like measles, if you have been "exposed" to an intellectual area of endeavor through taking a course in that field, you are considered to have accomplished the goal of general education (or acquired immunity).

If this remark seems too cynical, one should still bear in mind that it is not an unfair generalization of the kinds of activities now going on. A few colleges have put general education in the hands of students and asked them to acquire it by themselves; some have introduced a set of comprehensive examinations in the major areas which the student must pass and must prepare for in some manner or by some means.

Mayhew has noted that in the creation of new colleges, curriculum is frequently organized so as to have built-in interrelationships of the disciplines.[71] Probably the predominant alteration has had to do with the relocation of general education courses and requirements. "Reforming" is the word that Daniel Bell has used, and as he indicates this word was purposely chosen. Indeed, it is an apt term. His reformation calls for an extension of general education throughout the four years. Eckelberry had earlier argued that education is an organism: it grows at all times and is not a mechanical foundation that serves as the base (first two years) for a superstructure.[72]

Historically, this change presents a curious phenomenon. With the conception of the general education movement more than a score of years ago, the placement of general education in the first two years of post-high school education was defended on at least two strong grounds. First, general education was that education which was essential for all, and since the evidence indicated that a large number of students never completed their four-year collegiate program, if these students were to receive their necessary education (general education), it would have to be provided at the beginning of their college careers. The second major argument had to do with the reason that such an education was essential before one began to specialize. A curriculum was to be built which assumed the general education as a base before professional training could begin.

Today the arguments tend to ignore the question of whether many or few actually complete four years of education. What one reads today is more like the following. The knowledge explosion has made it necessary for the student to specialize for a full, four-year period if he is to achieve the level of competency needed for his professional work or to go on to graduate school. Furthermore, those elements of general education that deal with interdisciplinary notions or the philosophy of a subject can only be mastered after one has accumulated a large body of knowledge in a quite specific area.[73] Therefore, general education should come at the end, not at the beginning. Thus, we find "capstone" courses; or we find courses that deal with methods of inquiry distributed over the entire four-year period. Remarks from practitioners corroborate this assertion:

> I think that you will agree that our program is an attempt to extend general education through the student's four years of college without depriving him of the opportunity to have a strong major.

> The capstone course is an important and final element in coordinating the general education offerings. It is a senior inter-disciplinary course.

> This (the aims of the college's program) will best occur as a culmination rather than as an introduction during the academic tenure of students on our campuses.

Thus, it seems that early specialization has won out, rightly or wrongly. The desire and wishes of faculty members and students fostered by images and realities created by the graduate schools, heedful of pressures from parents who want their child to go to college and have a vocation he can practice four years later, and accompanied by a change of faculty attitude that rewards almost everything except general education--these factors result in a movement of general education away from its orientation and introductory position in the liberal arts college. If general education is to remain a component of liberalizing education, the only direction it can take is toward the upper-level years, and that is where it is going.

Naturally, there are disadvantages to such a relocation and--hopefully--reconstruction. Although it was true in but a handful of institutions, at one time advanced courses were constructed upon the common foundation of all students: their first- and second-year general education courses. At some institutions a common learning even produced the opportunity for an intellectual dialogue among students in general and without respect to their intended area of specialization. These advantages would now disappear.

On the other hand, relocation and realteration now allow for and require faculty creativity. New courses must be devised, and the scholarly talents of those who derive great satisfaction from this kind of effort find a new challenge. Even the novice faculty members should be attracted to such programs. And there are other advantages that can be readily perceived. For example, courses such as Bell and others describe most likely would not have the same kind of permanence that the freshman and sophomore general courses typically acquired. Different faculty can create and re-create them. Furthermore, when these courses are at the junior and senior level, they take on more prestige within the academic pecking order and thus should attract talented faculty. One should expect such outcomes to be good.

Some of the reasons for changes in liberal arts colleges have been indicated along the way. Others can be mentioned. For example, calendar manipulation can increase use of physical facilities and hence permit growth without new construction. (So far, however, students and faculty members have not ecstatically extolled year-round operations.) Calendar change also has been introduced for educational reasons: the common pursuit throughout a college for a month of forced independent study and time for faculty writing are the intended benefits.

Similarly, the notion of only three courses per term is defended on the ground that depth of learning is a major goal and that the simultaneous taking of four or five courses jeopardizes one or two by slighting them or forcing each to be done in such a shallow way that none is worth doing. Evidence to support this position is not available.

Sometimes somewhat less "ethical" forces produce some of the changes described above. Foundations have supported some of this kind of reorganization with good reason and good intention. Other colleges have followed in hopes of outside support, or for attention-getting devices, or because the elite of the liberal arts colleges have done so, or....

Changes of these kinds are called "innovations" rather than "experiments," and rightly so, but probably for the wrong reasons. Most often no experiment is conducted comparing one procedure to another; rather, something different is put into operation and the existent procedure is terminated. This different procedure may not be new, except to the college introducing it, but in this special sense the college is innovating. (Today it is "good" to be considered "innovative"; "experimental" has taken on the connotation of being far removed from center, of being uncertain and/or untried, and that is "bad.")

Innovation flourishes and will continue. It is chic.

Some years ago Henry M. Wriston wrote that change was essential if for no other reason than to discover old truths once again.[74] This is an insightful truth; furthermore, it has an amazing fringe corollary. Almost any experiment in education is good, simply because it is done for the reason that faculty members care. When they care, their enthusiasm is high. And when their enthusiasm is high, effective learning takes place. What they find exciting becomes contagious, and whether it is general education or something else, enthusiastic change breeds significant education. In a way, this is the Hawthorne effect, only slightly modified. As one person (who was reviewing the general education movement in the past tense) remarked: "Some of the experiments were utter failures, but the people who participated learned a good deal from them, and I doubt if they did the students very much harm."

There are many important reasons why experimentation and innovation in undergraduate education should not only continue but accelerate. By these means more is learned about how people learn. The teaching of abstract mathematics and science in high school and now in elementary grades has occurred, and one can anticipate its spread. Thus, young people come to college prepared in quite different ways than they were in the past. There is less agreement whether a similar movement in the social sciences and humanities can be effective. Nevertheless, realistic revision of programs for students differently prepared than in the past is called for. The liberal arts colleges, with their concern for liberal and general education, are ideal places for such investigation. The reforming of general and liberal education must also be involved. A faculty at a liberal arts college has its first commitment to teaching (and hence to learning), and one therefore expects attention continuously to focus on curricular matters.

At least four other social forces have had an impact on the liberal arts college and its treatment of and concern for general education. These forces are economic pressures, changing leadership in higher education, a changing younger generation, and a mobile faculty. They can be analyzed and extrapolated along future alternative routes.

The problem of dollars and cents and the general education program for the liberal arts college is not one that can be set aside lightly. As one dean said: "Any college that contemplates going into the field of general education should do so with a full realization that this type of education is expensive--more instructors are required and more versatile instructors are required." Or as another dean remarked: "Meeting the financial competition in such a way as to secure the very best minds and personalities for these colleges (as opposed to the schools dedicated primarily to technology and research) is a grave problem."

One procedure (mentioned earlier) used by some institutions to partially solve the problem of cost has been the creation of a single introductory course for those students who are not majoring in that area. In this way efficiency results. Also, of necessity the very small college must offer a restricted number of courses. It will be much more expensive for these institutions than for others to relocate general education courses in the upper-level years.

Money is not always a negative factor in general education programs, particularly when required courses are placed in the earlier years. A department (or division) can have parochial reasons for offering to devise and teach a general course for all non-majors.

If the course is taught by large lecture sections, as frequently is the case, the service function permits the department to justify teaching advanced courses to very small groups, numbers so small that pressures to cancel the class would be unbearable were not the general education course visibly there to balance the college's policy of "X" students per faculty member.

An interesting concomitant to this phenomenon can sometimes be observed. The insecure department (one not drawing a strong coterie of students or not growing at an average rate) or the ambitious department (one wishing to increase its offerings and specialties) need one or two faculty members who are willing to be the "general education" teacher. And if they find such a teacher, he will be treated kindly. Even though he is regarded by his associates as inferior and not qualified to have the senior tutorials or seminars, he nonetheless can be promoted for the offerings made possible and paid for by his courses, as well as on the grounds of his "good teaching," which, after all, everyone says (and knows?) should be rewarded as much as the usual kind of scholarship. Or such are the words mouthed by those who ultimately make such decisions.

Everything taken into account, though, in the energies of liberal arts colleges directed toward the saving and raising of money (consortium for insurance savings, sharing of facilities, etc.), one seldom hears that funds are needed for the general education program.

So problems persist, at least for some of the liberal arts colleges and hence for general education programs in these institutions. Some ailments are the accidents of time and will require ingenious men to produce worthy solutions. In this connection, one thinks of geography and magnitude.

Colleges which are located in nobody's greater metropolitan area not only are trying to exist in an urbanized and increasingly secular world; they are also finding themselves with only a meager source of people in the community who can contribute their special talents when specialization is so much in demand. The related problem--for these colleges also tend to be small in size--has to do with the awkwardness of economics in administrative and faculty matters. Some comments reflect this dilemma:

> Add a faculty member and you add another specialized course or two in his field.
>
> In the past few years subject matter specialists continued to increase the number of hours required for the major.
>
> We felt that as a medium-sized liberal arts college we could not possibly be all things to all men...and as a private college of liberal arts and science with limited facilities, we cannot realistically hope to accomplish what other more specialized institutions can do more effectively.

The farmer buys out his neighbor, for he can farm profitably only if he farms more acres. So he knows how to grow, and he grows to survive. Some liberal arts colleges have reacted in a similar fashion.

But growth most frequently means more courses, more departments: in short, it means that colleges must become more like other institutions that already exist. Next the M.A.T. is added, and since this means graduate work in some disciplines, it is suggested that the M.A. be offered. If the M.A. is a success, then.... The spiral continues. It is obvious that this path can lead to rather dire outcomes. As a college grows in more and more ways, it becomes less different and distinct; likewise, the opportunities for innovation and for the solving of the problems of general and liberal education probably diminish.[75]

One's perspective often suffers from myopia, particularly when his momentary historical argument rests upon the "great person" thesis. In fact, history might even prove that when one is in the middle of any event, one cannot very well tell who tomorrow's leaders will be. Nonetheless, when one looks at the dignitaries who have already left the scene, we can be certain we are in an open-ended period of drought. Political columists invoke this prognosis year after year, decade after decade. Fully cognizant of the possible pitfalls, I am still willing to nibble this bait.

The University of Minnesota, Florida State University, and Michigan State University, to mention but three giants, will soon or already have faced the problem of replacing the distinguished gentlemen who head their general education programs and who have given so much to the general education movement. These universities operate mammoth organizations and deal with hundreds of faculty members and thousands of students. It is impossible to know or predict what will happen to major university sources of general education for liberal arts colleges when these men's successors assume managerial and leadership responsibilities. Earlier it was remarked that Harvard and Chicago have not replaced their leaders of general education. From our analysis we should anticipate that Minnesota, Florida State, Michigan State, and others like them will not do so either.

The inheritor of an educational adventure understandably wants to imprint a distinctive stamp on his college. General education is yesterday's model, his predecessor's claim to fame. So, the passing of time and the succession of leadership, like the anticipated consequence of the concern for dollars, mitigate against general education. However, unlike the pressures that can be caused by money shortages, undergraduate liberal education need not be hurt by new leadership; in fact, new leaders can be its vigorous advocates. The reforming and recasting of curriculum might receive incentive from leadership changes, and hence these changes may cast illumination rather than dark shadows.

Today's college student is a different person from his predecessor of the not very distant past. The complacent (at least on the surface) youth of the recent past were insensitive to the onset of the plague. (Camus and Lawrence touched but a few.) Even earlier, the courses that were proposed and taught in the initial years of the general education movement--courses dealing with guidance and counseling, marriage and the family, etc.--seem unbelievably incongruous today when jobs go begging in major university cities. Today's young person has lived and learned on the streets of the city; civil rights cannot possibly escape his attention, nor for that matter can the problems all over the face of the globe. His accelerated launching toward adulthood has probably given him all the heterosexual and other kinds of experiences he is likely to have in the remainder of his life; he has read the banned and unbanned books. In short, he is not pure, simple, and unwashed. New programs of general education--or liberal education, if one prefers the latter--must take into account the fact that youth today is more sophisticated, even if it is not older, nor wiser. Different experiences, insecurities of a different kind, and goals of a different nature distinguish today's young student from his young father. Recognition of such differences must underlie a curriculum if it is to remain viable. Few institutions have fully taken into account this significant change in their students. The future plans of colleges, including many of the most advanced, continue to take the posture that the secondary schools are handing them chaste adolescents. One cannot help but feel that colleges will have to react to their new clientele, whether they wish to do so or not. (Many colleges, of course, wish the clientele would change, but they really know it will not.)[76] Among the other talents of this generation is the knowledge of how to demonstrate.

All of this is to be taken as a sign, or at least as an opportunity for future improvement. Curriculum change will have to occur. That which is not useful will have to be discarded. Faculty members have demonstrated in the past that they can create new experiences. Thus, one should take an optimistic view of a healthy reformation of general education. As one dean remarked: "We have always argued that the virtue of studying at the small college...is that it permits the students to become closely acquainted with faculty. That is a good thing, of course, only when the faculty is worth knowing." That is a rather bitter expression of opinion, but in too many instances it may strike close to the truth. As the following may also:

> My deepest concern as I leave the campus of this

> (excellent) college is for the retention of the fine faculty.... So much of our dreaming about new programs, new experiments within old and established programs, hinge upon continuity of personnel, and I know well enough that whatever their professed contempt for lives dominated by material considerations, academic people may be made to jump through the hoops too.

Mobility of faculty is at an all-time high, as we have noted. It is not clear whether dollars and cents and smaller teaching loads are the principal or sole reasons. But if the supply of highly qualified teachers remains small, it is inevitable that mobility will produce a greater distortion between the haves and have-nots. The best will get better, the marginal will become weaker, and the poor must stay poor.

Requests that graduate schools convert to producing teachers for general education and for liberal arts colleges is a record that gets replayed periodically. It would be better to discard it than to listen to it again, so completely unrealistic is its pious plea. One can also question the value of such a request, but this is rarely done. The outstanding contributors to the general education movement, and to liberal education in general, have been those who have been trained in traditional ways, as narrow and as specialized as those ways might be. For any of a number of reasons, these persons were attracted to the notion of liberally educating themselves. When today's faculty members have decided that such is a worthy task and that there are educational institutions concerned with educating a whole man, they will migrate to these places, make their contributions, and live a life of genuine contribution and personal reward. Mobility will slow down. Perhaps the problem for the future is simply one of holding the line for a rather short period of time until some kind of stabilized and manageable growth occurs.[77] However, if the liberal arts college stays with general education simply because it is unwilling or unable to change, or because the alternative that suggests itself is a small university with departments (a role it cannot assume), this certainly would be a disastrous reason for such a school to persist as an institution of higher education.

The faculty will remain the key problem for these colleges, and it already has been said that

> competition for the better people is greater each year. If the extraordinary person can be persuaded to accept the initial appointment in the face of more evident rewards--monetary, research time, more favorable teaching load, fringe benefits, etc.--which are presented to him from the larger public institutions, he is likely to find personal compensations in the active small college which balance out and he tends to remain in the setting.

Bell suggests that retired professors might be a good source of faculty for general education courses.[78] In my view, however, this lessens rather than enhances the prestige of a general education course. Not that these professors would not be good teachers for these courses; many of them would be and are outstanding. But the mere fact that they would have been put in this program as a "last resort" would give the program precisely the opposite status of that desired. New situations and an opportunity to create new kinds of courses for a new breed of students ought to attract that "new breed" of faculty which we are told exists.

As we have seen, the general education movement is dead. What remains to be examined are the vestiges of the created structures and the manner in which new forms are arising to accomplish the same end: the acquisition of a liberal education with its continued faith in the unity of knowledge--a goal that the movement never accomplished.

In our examination of the activities of the liberal arts colleges, we have already seen some of the responses these institutions are making to the changing scene. To argue for an exclusive democracy today as it was a generation or so ago, or to continue to ignore the non-occidental world smacks of a provincialism that hardly anyone defends. The year of study abroad and courses in non-Western cultures replace the attention to a way of life that dictated the general education movement.

As the cross-disciplinary courses leave the scene, more emphasis is being given to the single course as a prototype for an area. Capstone courses and courses in modes of inquiry and ways of knowing, many of which remain in the planning stage, are a closer but different substitute for the interdisciplinary approaches. The form of the administration of these courses, however, is not and will not be a joint faculty effort. In an era in which it seems impossible to obtain consensus on any national or international issue--that is, to actually engage in a genuine movement--one will not find associations of faculty directed toward an education enterprise such as liberal education. No one seems to be advocating a return to a complete elective system, so that requirements of about a year (as a minimum) "outside" of the student's field of specialization should continue. But the typical offerings from which the student selects will be private and changing and not from a unified and interdisciplinary staff. Some colleges already have moved into the future.[79]

The avant garde will not be the general education of the past; reformation is a must, so it seems, and this reform may be the healthiest thing that could happen to liberal education today. The editorial by Robert D. Patton, cited earlier, raised the question of whether the "general studies" were going or coming.[80] The answer is both: the old is going, and a new is coming.

FOOTNOTES

1. R. P. McKeon, ed., The Basic Works of Aristotle, p. 1306. New York, Random House, 1941.

2. Russell Thomas, "Will the Liberal Arts College Return to Liberal Education? I. Education at Amherst." Journal of General Education, vol. 9, p. 161-68. April, 1956.

3. G. W. Pierson, "The Elective System and the Difficulties of College Planning, 1870-1940." Journal of General Education, vol. 4, p. 165-74. April, 1950.

4. James S. Rice, "General Education: Present Conditions." Journal of General Education, vol. 14, No. 2, p. 77-81. July, 1962.

5. Daniel Bell, The Reforming of General Education, p. vii-xii. New York, Columbia University Press, 1966.

6. See vol. 34, No. 7, p. 396-98. October, 1963.

7. Bernard Wishy, "General Education in Extremis: How Can It Be Restored to Health?" Journal of Higher Education, vol. 34, No. 5, p. 270-77. May, 1963.

8. Edward A. Carlin, "General Education for the Future." In James S. Rice, ed., General Education: Current Ideas and Concerns, p. 66. Washington, Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1964.

9. Joseph Axelrod, "New Patterns of Internal Organization." In Logan Wilson, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, p. 41. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965.

10. Harold L. Hodgkinson, "General Education in the Liberal Arts College." Remarks prepared as chairman of the Committee on Undergraduate Education, A.H.E., private communication, August 15, 1966.

11. Lewis Mayhew, "The New Colleges," p. 1-26, and Earl J. McGrath and S. Richard Meeth, "Organizing for Teaching and Learning: The Curriculum," p. 27-48. In Samuel Baskin, ed., Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1965.

12. Roger R. Kelsey, A.H.E. Bibliography on Higher Education. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1966.

13. John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition. New York, Harper, 1958.

14. Hoyt Trowbridge, "Forty Years of General Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 11, No. 3, p. 161-69. July, 1958.

15. See Part II. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939.

16. Robert M. Hutchins, The Higher Learning. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1936.

17. Stewart G. Cole, Liberal Education in a Democracy. New York, Harper, 1940. Russell Thomas, The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962. Bell, *op. cit.*

18. For those who have not had the opportunity to avail themselves of the cited (or other) sources, the following brief definition of the general education movement and the structures it assumed may be helpful.

Within the historic tradition of a liberal education resides a deep faith in the existence of a unity of knowledge. Portions of this belief have been expressed in educational institutions by attention to our heritage from the Greeks and the Western world. The uncontrolled elective system allowed students to receive degrees without ever contacting significant sectors of human inquiry and without confronting an attempted synthesis of knowledge. The general education movement was a reaction against the existing fragmentation. That it crystallized at a time when "learning by doing" and a concern for democracy also dominated the scene in part accounts for the variegated forms one finds under the title "general education." A few colleges placed their principal focus upon the learner and his (or her, for some of the principal leaders in this response were newly created women's colleges) problems. Other colleges reacted by specifying that the degree candidate must take a certain number of courses in each of a designated number of broad intellectual areas so that at a minimum contact was made with the dimensions of knowledge. A few institutions selected the classics of our heritage and gave these books the dominant place in their program. A larger number of colleges responded by constructing special first-year courses for the non-majors, the physics for poets course, for example, one which differs from an introductory course not only in its employment of mathematical language but also in its effort to be a prototype of all science as well as in the fact that the course is terminal. (There is not a second course following it.)

All of the above have been subsumed under the term "general education," although not always by the institutions involved. However, there remains one other response to the concern for the unity of knowledge, principally for integration and the Western tradition. Many colleges and universities constructed entire new programs with sets of specified courses as requirements for graduation. Integration was to be achieved by dealing with the common elements of the related disciplines. A characteristic of these courses was their cross-disciplinary content, with, for example, astronomy, geology, meteorology, physics, and chemistry all being a part of a physical science course. That faculty from different disciplines shared responsibilities and that new examinations (frequently "objective" in kind) had to be constructed are but two of the new events which accompany this response. It is principally this approach to the unity of knowledge that gave meaning to the general education movement.

19. Cooperation in General Education. Washington, American Council on Education, 1947.

20. Lucius Garvin, "General Education in the Liberal Arts College." Journal of General Education, vol. 2, No. 2, p. 117-20. January, 1948. Charles L. Stone, "Some Postulates of General Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 2, No. 1, p. 24-26. October, 1947.

21. Earl J. McGrath, "General Education, a Review," Journal of General Education, vol. 2, No. 4, p. 267-77. July, 1948.

22. Henry M. Wriston, "The Brown University Curriculum." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 19, No. 3, p. 109-15. March, 1948.

23. Harold Taylor, as quoted by R. H. Eckelberry, "Editorial Comments." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 17, No. 1, p. 50-51. January, 1946.

24. David Owen, "Harvard General Education in Social Science." Journal of General Education, vol. 5, p. 17. October, 1950.

25. Edward A. Carlin and Edward B. Blackman, eds., Curriculum Building in General Education. Marjorie Carpenter, ed., The Larger Learning. James A. Fisher, ed., The Humanities in General Education. Robert R. Haun, ed., Science in General Education. Lewis B. Mayhew, ed., Social Science in General Education. Horace T. Morse and Paul L. Dressel, eds., General Education for Personal Maturity. Francis Shoemaker and Louis Forsdale, eds., Communications in General Education. All published in Dubuque, Iowa, William C. Brown Co., 1960.

26. Lewis B. Mayhew, ed., General Education: An Account and Appraisal. New York, Harper, 1960.

27. Paul L. Dressel and Lewis B. Mayhew, General Education: Explorations in Evaluation. Washington, American Council on Education, 1954.

28. Journal of General Education, vol. 12, No. 4, p. 187-88. October, 1959.

29. The journal resumed publication later on with a new location, editor, and format; in fact, about the only thing that did not change was the name.

30. Karl W. Bigelow and Malcolm S. MacLean, "Dominant Trends in General Education." In NSSE 38th Yearbook, op. cit., p. 351-80.

31. Journal of General Education, vol. 1, No. 1, p. 3. October, 1946. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 83. January, 1947.

32. Journal of Higher Education, vol. 19, No. 3, p. 155-56. March, 1948.

33. Edward Rosenheim, "Editorial Comment." Journal of General Education, vol. 8, No. 4, p. 211-12. July, 1955.

34. Joseph R. Gusfield, "General Education as a Career: A Sociological Analysis." Journal of General Education, vol. 10, No. 1, p. 37-48. January, 1957.

35. F. D. Kershner, Jr., "Career Problems of Instructors in General Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 9, No. 3, p. 146-51. April, 1956. Sigmund Nosow, "The Labor Market for Teachers of General Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 11, No. 1, p. 45-50. January, 1958.

36. Sidney J. French, "The Academic Status of General Education; The Need for an Association." Journal of General Education, vol. 14, p. 1-9. April, 1962.

37. Bell, op. cit., p. 181-83.

38. Allan M. Cartter, "A New Look at the Supply of College Teachers." Educational Record, vol. 45, No. 3, p. 259-66. Summer, 1965. More precisely, Cartter demonstrated that the percentage of Ph.D.'s on faculties in all kinds of institutions of higher education has been increasing, not decreasing, over the years. The matter of numbers remains muddied since the total demand is unknown. The reader should watch for a new analysis from Cartter. A background paper prepared for the October, 1966, American Council on Education's annual meeting extrapolates a convergence of supply and demand around the year 1970.

39. Lewis B. Mayhew, "General Education--A Decade of Change." Journal of General Education, vol. 9, No. 2, p. 112-18. January, 1956.

40. Howard A. Cutler, "Editorial Comment." Journal of General Education, vol. 14, unnumbered three pages preceeding p. 77. July, 1962.

41. The literature in this realm abounds, ranging from the popular, but unreliable, press to the serious studies of campus climates and student psychiatry. The topic resides outside the domain of this report. Nonetheless, one brief document well captures the essence of my concern, one deriving from the United States National Student Association and written by Edward J. Shoben: Students, Stress and the College Experience. Washington, U. S. National Student Association. May, 1966.

42. There has not been corresponding publicity demonstrating that, say, medical schools practice their pronouncements; hence aspirants could understandably view the words of medical schools with suspicion.

43. Knox C. Hill, "Editorial Comment." Journal of General Education, vol. 4, p. 1-2. June, 1958.

44. My own observation has been that one sees good general education programs only when liberally educated scientists are on the faculty. Obviously the faculty must also contain liberally educated humanists and social scientists for a successful program. These two groups seem more plentiful, but certainly not preponderant. Moreover, as some of the social sciences "harden their core," they too may disappear from the already thin ranks of faculty willing to participate in "liberal studies." Economists and sociologists are two scarce breeds today.

45. Sidney J. French, "The Place of Science in General Education: A Conference Report." Journal of General Education, vol. 4, No. 1, p. 68-71. October, 1949.

46. Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education. New York, Vintage, 1960.

47. Bell, op. cit., p. 176-78.

48. Horace T. Morse, "Liberal and General Education: A Problem of Differentiation." In Rice, op. cit., p. 7-12.

49. David Riesman, "Innovation and Reaction in Higher Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 16, No. 3, p. 177-95. October, 1964.

50. Ibid., p. 193.

51. Bell, op. cit., p. 193. Dipping into his personal history, he speaks of "the drag of large staff courses."

52. Morris Keeton, "Antioch Redesigns Its General Education Program." Journal of General Education, vol. 10, No. 3, p. 145-49. July, 1957.

53. Nelson B. Henry, ed., General Education. Fifty-First Yearbook, Part I, National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1952.

54. Jacques Barzan, "College to University--And After." American Scholar, p. 212-19. Spring, 1964.

55. Some extended remarks on the future of independent liberal arts colleges are advanced in the next section, p. 43-66 ff.

56. Another area that might well be worthy of study is the movement in higher education that in one way is within the society but in reality, particularly for the liberal arts college, is outside of it. Executive secretaries for this and that new association, personnel to study such and such under a grant from so and so, and similar activities may very well be draining more than an insignificant share of able people from positions of leadership, and the cause of general education may thereby be suffering.

57. Howard D. Marshall, The Mobility of College Faculty. New York, Pageant Press, 1964. David B. Brown, The Market for College Teachers: An Economic Analysis of Career Patterns Among Southeastern Social Scientists. Chapel Hill, N. C., University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

58. After all, a move every year or two makes future employers wary; did the person really move by choice, or was it by request? A second-rate person on paper, might be a better bet than a supposed star who is always malcontent. Even if he is a "star" (and not a meteorite) and is sought after, his wife will eventually protest vehemently, if not for the sake of their children's schooling, then for some other good female cause. Even the professor could grow weary of applying for new driver's licenses, insurance policies, etc. The increasing red tape of today's existence also takes its pint of blood in the moving process.

59. James Hedegard, now at the Center for Research on Teaching and Learning at the University of Michigan, has begun preliminary research. An index similar to that of Pace and Stern has been administered at one college.

60. Mathew B. Miles, ed., Innovation in Education. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia, 1964.

61. Ibid., p. 657.

62. McGrath, "General Education, a Review," op. cit. Horace T. Morse, "The Design and Operation of Programs of General Education." In NSSE, 51st Yearbook, op. cit., p. 366 ff. Mayhew, ed., General Education, op. cit., p. 190-205.

63. Morris Keeton, "Liberal Education--An Open Future." In the Foreword of "A Key to the Future--Significant Purpose." FLAC

(Study of the Future of Liberal Arts Colleges) preliminary copy, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1966.

64. It is acknowledged that some colleges are closing, but they are few in number. Most of those that do fold probably should; a reincarnation might be easier and bring forth a more presentable new character than could be produced by a continued struggle for revitalization. Also, a not impossible eventuality is that the liberal arts college might be given a quality of eliteness in today's affluent society, simply because it is scarce and because it will enjoy a false reputation of class distinctiveness carried over from an era long since past. It was Gertrude Stein who remarked one time on the fashion of the female chest. She indicated that it, like a wagon wheel, was displayed when the function for which it was designed no longer was called for. Should liberal arts colleges persist simply because there are enough people with enough money who would send their children to them for all of the wrong reasons, one can only hope that they die a quick and peaceful death.

65. Baskin, ed., op. cit.

66. Brubacher and Rudy, op. cit., p. 264.

67. Ward Morehouse, "Asian Studies in Undergraduate Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 11, No. 3, p. 125-40. July, 1958.

68. Journal of General Education, vol. 12, No. 1. January, 1959.

69. Charles L. Stone, "The Dartmouth Curriculum." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 18, No. 6, p. 295-97. June, 1947.

70. Charles C. Cole, Jr. and Lanora G. Lewis, Flexibility in the Undergraduate Curriculum. U. S. Office of Education, New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 10. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1962.

71. Mayhew, "The New Colleges," op. cit.

72. Journal of Higher Education, vol. 18, No. 4, p. 219. April, 1947.

73. Herbert Weisinger, "In Criticism of General Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 15, No. 3, p. 161-74. October, 1963.

74. Henry M. Wriston, "A Critical Appraisal of Experiments in General Education." In NSSE 38th Yearbook, op. cit., p. 321.

75. David Riesman, Constraint and Variety in American Education. Garden City, N. Y., Anchor, 1958.

76. This assertion is not in contradiction to the statement made earlier that colleges exist for a faculty.

77. One must remain pessimistic, however, in regard to the liberal arts college recapturing an able science faculty. Hence, a deficiency in an essential dimension would continue in a general education program, no matter how reformed it became. Perhaps the mature and middle-aged scientist, past his most productive years, could be attracted to a novel teaching opportunity at a liberal arts college?

78. Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 298-99.

79. Goodwin Watson, "Some Notes on Experimental Colleges in America." Presented at the Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education Conference, Boston, Spring, 1966.

80. Patton, *op. cit.*

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This section of the monograph is organized in such a way as to direct the reader to bibliographies of various kinds (simple, collected, and annotated). Some "classical" works on general education are included, followed by major contributions made along the route of the general education movement, and then by references to some significant contributions on the state of higher education in general. Finally, a brief glance at some of the current problems and issues in general education in liberal arts colleges is taken, with a special concern for what might be involved in reconstructing general education.

This bibliography is not exhaustive; it makes no attempt to record all findings in the search of the literature; rather, it is a selected collection and is further sorted by the fact that only a handful of the entries are annotated. The few publications that are not included in one of these lists, including those referred to in the main body of the text, are those published since August, 1966.

As was noted in the text, a genuine drought exists in books on general education. Thus, most of the existing ones have been reviewed extensively and are already well known. Some of the works cited in the main body of this review have been listed here because they belong in both places. Also included are works of genuine magnitude and importance that belong here and could have been used in the argument advanced earlier, but were not. To simply cite them without an annotated review may seem unfair at first glance, but the mere fact of their inclusion should indicate their significance.

Published Bibliographies

(A) Nonannotated:

1. McGrath, Earl, "A Bibliography on General Education." Educational Record, vol. 21. p. 96-118. 1940.

2. Lyons, William N., "A Further Bibliography in General Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 4, p. 72-80. October, 1949.

3. Dressel, Paul L., and Lewis B. Mayhew, "A Selected Bibliography on General Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 8, No. 4, p. 261-86. July, 1955.

4. Kelsey, Roger R., A.H.E. Bibliography on Higher Education. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1966.

5. Harris, Chester W., ed., "General Education." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, p. 570-83. New York, Macmillan, 1960.

6. Wilson, Logan, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington, American Council on Education, 1956.

The 600 entries in (3) are primarily for the period from 1951 through 1953, but they are not exclusively so; they do go back in time but do not include any of the entries in the first two items. Item (4) has little on general education. Hence, there is an hiatus beginning with (3).

Walter S. Monroe was the editor of the earlier 1950 edition of (5). The earlier volume, as well as this one, concludes with extensive nonannotated bibliographies. The author-contributors to (6) vary considerably in the literature they cite, but many important sources are revealed; for example, Joseph Axelrod provides an excellent and extensive bibliography on p. 57-61.

(b) Annotated:

7. Morse, Horace T., "Annotated Bibliography of Selected References on General Education." In James Rice, General Education: Current Ideas and Concerns, p. 79-86. Washington, National Education Association, 1964.

8. Mayhew, Lewis B., "The Literature of Higher Education, 1965." Educational Record, vol. 47, No. 1, p. 18-49. Winter, 1966.

9. Meeth, L. Richard, Selected Issues in Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography. New York, Teachers College Press, Columbia, 1965.

10. Charles, Norman, "The College Curriculum: An Annotated Bibliography of Recent Literature." Educational Record, vol. 46, No. 4, p. 439-56. Fall, 1965.

Overlapping occurs among these entries. For example, both (7) and (10) review the McGrath series of volumes on general education (footnote 25 in main text). Both (8) and (9) deal with all aspects of higher education; the latter, which is more than 200 pages in length, covers a longer historical period and includes articles as well as books.

The foregoing bibliographical references should direct the reader to practically all of the published literature on general education up to the fall of 1966.

The "Classics"

(a) Societal Contributions:

11. Changes and Experiments in Liberal Arts Education. 31st Yearbook of the National Study of Education, Part 2. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1932.

12. General Education in the American College. 38th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939.

13. A Design for General Education. Washington, American Council on Education, 1944. (American Council on Education Studies, vol. 8, No. 18, Series I.)

14. Cooperation in General Education. Washington, American Council on Education, 1947.

15. General Education. 51st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Listed in chronological order, these volumes, which are either reports or studies by collections of authorities, scan all aspects of the general education movement. Several of these chapters were cited in the main body of this review, and together they constitute a history one should not ignore.

(b) Institutional Contributions:

16. General Education in a Free Society. Report of the Harvard Committee. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1945.

17. A College Program in Action: A Review of Working Principles at Columbia College. Prepared by the Committee on College Plans of Columbia University. New York, Columbia University Press, 1946.

18. The Idea and Practice of General Education: An Account of the College of the University of Chicago. Prepared by Present and Former Members of the Faculty. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1950.

19. Bell, Daniel, The Reforming of General Education. New York, Columbia University Press, 1966.

Perhaps it is premature to place Daniel Bell's work in this distinguished category, but I think not. Bell's book seems destined to join the select set of its distinguished predecessors, most of which benefited from the wisdom of a collective enterprise and either joint or multiple authorship. His is an analysis of the developments and current status of undergraduate liberal education, particularly as it exists in complex universities and especially in his own college. It was, in fact, for his colleagues at Columbia that he prepared this "report".

Bell does not consider the problems that are unique to the independent and small liberal arts college; surprisingly, his work is more of a historical than a sociological analysis. He makes no attempt to cover all aspects of general education; e.g., little is said about pedagogy. On the other hand, Bell is concerned with what is taught and when--i.e., at what level, and to whom, but not under what conditions. This is not meant as a criticism, for his intent did not necessitate broaching such problems. Naturally Bell draws upon his own college (16), but since he also taught in the college at the University of Chicago and attributes great importance to the impact of the Harvard "red book," this volume provides an outstanding commentary on three classic works which need no further annotation here.

The General Education Movement

These volumes are listed without comment. Their chronology begins with the period selected as pivotal.

20. Johnson, Roy Ivan, ed., *Exploration in General Education.* New York, Harper, 1947.

21. Miller, Robert D., *General Education at Mid-Century; A Critical Analysis*. Tallahassee, Florida State University, 1950.

22. Morse, H. T., ed., *General Education in Transition: A Look Ahead.* Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1951.

23. Stickler, W. Hugh, ed., *Organization and Administration of General Education*. Dubuque, Iowa, William C. Brown Co., 1951.

24. Johnson, B. Lamar, *General Education in Action.* Washington, American Council on Education, 1952.

25. French, Sidney J., ed., *Accent on Teaching: Experiments in General Education.* New York, Harper, 1954.

26. Dressel, Paul L., and Lewis B. Mayhew, *General Education: Explorations in Evaluation*. Washington, American Council on Education, 1954.

27. Mayhew, Lewis B., ed., *General Education: An Account and Appraisal.* New York, Harper, 1960.

28. Thomas, Russell, *The Search for a Common Learning: General Education,* 1800-1960. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962.

29. Stickler, W. Hugh, ed., *Experimental Colleges: Their Role in American Higher Education.* Tallahassee, Florida State University, 1964.

30. Rice, James G., ed., *General Education: Current Ideas and Concerns*. Washington, Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1964.

Higher Education in General

To select but a few works from the many available in this category is precarious and difficult. What is attempted here is variety and at the same time some recognition of the first-rate observers of the current scene. Item (31) provides a needed historical and philosophical perspective, whereas (32) provides the insights of a sociologist--insights that foresaw the events that followed its writing. Items (33) and (34), the first singly and the latter by compendia, deal with the many dimensions of higher education today. So do (35) and (36), both of which are extensively reviewed by Mayhew in item (8).

31. Brubacher, John S., and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition. New York, Harper, 1958.

32. Riesman, David, Constraint and Variety in American Education. Garden City, N. Y., Anchor, 1958.

33. Henderson, Algo D., Policies and Practices in Higher Education. New York, Harper, 1960.

34. Wilson, Logan, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965.

35. Harris, Seymour E.,ed., Education and Public Policy. Berkeley, Calif., McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1965.

36. Harris, Seymour E., Kenneth M. Deitch, and Alan Levensohn, eds., Challenge and Change in American Education. Berkeley, Calif., McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1965.

Selected References on Current Topics and Problems in General Education and Liberal Arts Colleges

37. Baskin, Samuel, ed., Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1965.

The contributors to this volume describe what is active and new in higher education today. It names the colleges where new programs are being carried out. An annotated account of this book appears in items (8), (9), and (10). There is a danger in such efforts, one that has hopefully been avoided in the body of this monograph, namely, that the authors have been illustrative only in describing what is going on where, but not exhaustive in their approach. Thus, some institutions where significant new programs are being successfully carried out are slighted. It is next to impossible to be in on all of the "happenings" today, and, of course, no such treatment was intended when Baskin compiled this work.

A reforming or reconstructing of general education (or any other educational dogma) requires social action, a most difficult accomplishment. Among other dimensions, the following work surveys the political machinations involved.

38. Miles, Matthew B., ed., Innovation in Education. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia, 1964.

The author-editor of this unusual volume bemoans the lack of clear and unencumbered generalizations (except for statements such as innovation costs money) stemming from the contributions of many talented research workers. Nonetheless, if anyone desires to bring about any kind of educational change in his college, he would profit immensely from studying these documents and extrapolating that which fits his local case. After reading the more than 20 contributions, he may conclude that his college accommodates both a structure and a faculty (including perhaps an administration) that make change impossible; yet even then, he may have saved both the time and anxiety that any major experiment requires.

If anyone is contemplating reformation or reconstruction, he would be well advised to attend to some fundamental distinctions which have been deeply entrenched by those in the general education movement. The following three articles would be good places to start:

39. Pooley, Robert C., "The Relation Between Liberal Arts and General Education." Journal of General Education, vol. 6, No. 3, p. 157-60. April, 1952.

40. Marsden, Malcolm M., "General Education: Compromise Between Transcendentalism and Pragmatism." Journal of General Education, vol. 7, No. 4, p. 228-39. July, 1953.

41. Nostrand, Howard Lee, "The Agenda for a New Generation." Journal of General Education, vol. 10, No. 4, p. 190-204. October, 1957.

Pooley (39) concludes that general education has given life to liberal education--a strength that it needed. In his view, liberal education also supplied general education with a heritage it required. Marsden (40) carefully explores some basic differences between the humanists and the concerns usually associated with Dewey. That both of these camps exist today needs to be taken into account in future planning. Nostrand (41) claims a cyclic progression in educational movements, one which would make 1970 the beginning of a new era.

Much of the case presented in the main body of this volume rested upon my beliefs about faculty, their nature, and their numbers, especially for the future of undergraduate education in liberal arts colleges outside large universities. Four significant references on this subject are cited below.

42. Berelson, Bernard, Graduate Education in the United States. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960.

43. Stecklein, John E., and Ruth E. Eckert, An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Choice of College Teaching as a Career. Washington, Cooperative Research Program, U. S. Office of Education, January, 1958.

44. Gustad, John W., The Career Decisions of College Teachers. Research Monograph 2. Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, November, 1960.

45. Medalia, Nahum Z., On Becoming a College Teacher: A Review of Three Variables. Research Monograph 6. Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.

Berelson's study (42) is a masterpiece of care and attention, written in a clear and delightful manner. Few seem to have heeded what he discovered about the sources of students and faculty for the past, present, and future, for one continually hears the same cries for reforming the graduate schools and for developing new degrees. These are wails which he carefully traces to antiquity and in many cases shatters the bases for complaint. The person who is concerned about a faculty for the future must begin with this work.

Stecklein and Eckert (43) and Gustad (44) contribute two sound studies that Medalia (45) examines in detail, especially because they offer contradicting conclusions in more than one instance. Medalia suggests types of college cultures to which faculty might or might not "fit," and he bases them on notions and studies derived from Pace, Stern, Trow, and others. His ideas are conjectural, but they do suggest the direction of vitally needed research on the nature and characteristics of college and university faculties in the future.

REACTIONS

In order for this second series of "New Dimensions in Higher Education" to better serve the needs of colleges and universities throughout the nation, reader reaction is herewith being sought. In this instance, with respect to General Education in the Liberal Arts Colleges, the following questions are asked:

1. Can you suggest other completed research, the results of which would add significantly to this report?
2. What problems related to this subject should be given the highest priority, in terms of further research?
3. What helpful suggestions do you have for institutions or individual faculty members who are interested in improving their general education programs?
4. What has your institution done, or what does it propose to do, about changing or improving its general education program?
5. What can the United States Office of Education do to help colleges and universities help themselves?

Kindly address reactions to:

Dr. Winslow R. Hatch
Bureau of Higher Education Research
Office of Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202